arXiv:1401.4630v2 [math.FA] 9 Feb 2015

SPECTRA OF CANTOR MEASURES

XIN-RONG DAI

Abstract. A spectrum of a probability measure μ is a countable set Λ such that $\{\exp(-2\pi i\lambda\cdot),\ \lambda\in\Lambda\}$ is an orthogonal basis for $L^2(\mu)$. In this paper, we consider the problem when a countable set become the spectrum of the Cantor measure. Starting from tree labeling of a maximal orthogonal set, we introduce a new quantity to measure minimal level difference between a branch of the labeling tree and its subbranches. Then we use boundedness and linear increment of that level difference measurement to justify whether a given maximal orthogonal set is a spectrum or not. This together with the tree labeling of a maximal orthogonal set provides fine structures of spectra of Cantor measures. As applications of our justification, we provide a characterization for the integrally expanding set $K\Lambda$ of a spectrum Λ to be a spectrum again, thereby we find all integers K such that $K\Lambda_4$ are spectra of the 1/4-Cantor measure μ_4, where $\Lambda_4 := \{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} d_n 4^n : d_n \in \{0,1\}\}$ is the first known spectrum for μ_4. Furthermore, we construct a spectrum Λ such that the integrally shrinking set Λ/K is a maximal orthogonal set but not a spectrum for some integer K.

1. Introduction

A fundamental problem in harmonic analysis is whether $\{\exp(-2\pi i\lambda x),\ \lambda\in\Lambda\}$ is an orthogonal basis of $L^2(\mu)$, the space of all square-integrable functions with respect to a probability measure μ. The above probability measure μ is known as a *spectral measure* and the countable set Λ as its *spectrum*. Spectral theory for the Lebesgue measures on sets has been studied extensively since it initialed by Fuglede 1974 [11], see [10, 16, 24] and references therein. Recently, He, Lai and Lau [12] proved that a spectral measure is pure type (i.e. either absolutely continuous or singular continuous or counting measure). For singular continuous measures, the first spectral measure was found by Jorgenson and Pederson in 1998 [14], they proved that $\Lambda_4 := \{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} d_n 4^n : d_n \in \{0,1\}\}$ is a spectrum of the Bernoulli convolution μ_4. Since then, some significant progresses have been made and various new phenomena different from spectral theory for the Lebesgue measure have been discovered [1–9,13–15,23]. For instance, Fourier frames on the unit interval $[0,1)$ have Beurling dimension one [17], while spectra of a singular measure could have zero Beurling dimension [2]. Here we define the *Cantor measure*

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* primary 42A65, 42B05, secondary 28A78, 28A80.

Key words and phrases. Spectral measure, Cantor measure, Bernoulli convolution, spectrum, maximal orthogonal set.

The research is partially supported by the NSF of China (No. 11371383) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities.

$\mu_{q,b}$ with $2 \le q \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q < b \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mu_{q,b} = \frac{1}{q}\sum_{i=0}^{q-1} \mu_{q,b}(f_i^{-1}(\cdot)), \tag{1.1}$$

is a self-similar probability measure associated with the iterated function system,

$$f_i(x) = x/b + i/q, \quad i = 0, 1, \ldots, q-1.$$

And we call the special case $\mu_b := \mu_{2,b}$ the *Bernoulli convolutions*. In 1998, Jorgenson and Pederson proved in their seminal paper [14] that Bernoulli convolutions μ_b with $b \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ are spectral measures. The converse problem stood for a long time and it was solved in [1] by the author in 2012 after important contributions by Hu and Lau [13]. The complete characterization for Bernoulli convolutions in [1] was recently extended by He, Lau and the author [4] to the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ that it is a spectral measure if and only if

$$2 \le q, \ b/q \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{1.2}$$

The Cantor measures $\mu_{q,b}$ with q and b satisfying (1.2) are few of known singular spectral measures, but the structure of their spectra is little known, even for the Bernoulli convolution μ_4. In this paper, we explore fine structure of spectra of these Cantor measures.

Our exploration starts from tree structure of a *(maximal) orthogonal set* Λ, meaning that $\{\exp(-2\pi i\lambda x), \ \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is a (maximal) orthogonal set of $L^2(\mu_{q,b})$. In 2009, Dutkay, Han and Sun gave a complete characterization of the maximal orthogonal sets of the Bernoulli convolution μ_4 by introducing a tree labeling tool [6]. Recently, He, Lai and the author developed a tree labeling technique for Cantor measures $\mu_{q,b}$ [2]. They proved that a countable set is a maximal orthogonal set of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ if and only if it can be labeled as a maximal tree, see Theorem 2.2. Thus maximal orthogonal sets have tree structure and they can be built selecting maximal tree appropriately. While a maximal orthogonal set is not necessarily a spectrum since it may lack of completeness in $L^2(\mu_{q,b})$. The completeness of maximal orthogonal sets for Cantor measures $\mu_{q,b}$ is quite challenging, see [2, 4, 6–8, 14, 23] for various sufficient and necessary conditions. In fact, the completeness of exponential sets is a classical problem in Fourier analysis since 1930s', see [18–22, 25] and references therein for historical remarks and recent advances.

The main contribution of this paper is to introduce a quantity $\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta}$ to measure minimal level difference between a branch δ of the labeling tree and its subbranches, see Definition 2.3. We show in Theorem 2.4 that a maximal orthogonal set Λ with maximal tree labeling τ is a spectrum if $\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta}$ is uniform bounded on all tree branches δ, and also in Theorem 2.5 that it is not a spectrum if $\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta}$ increases linearly to the level of the tree branches δ.

Unlike spectra of the Lebesgue measure on the unit interval, a spectrum Λ of a singular measure could have the integrally rescaled set $K\Lambda$ being its spectrum too, see [7, 8, 14] for the Bernoulli convolution μ_4. In this paper, we apply our

completeness results in Theorems 2.4 and 2.5 to characterize the spectral property of the rescaled set $K\Lambda$ for a given spectrum Λ of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ via no repetend of K for the labeling tree of Λ. As corollaries, we find all integers K such that $K\Lambda_4$ are spectra of the Bernoulli convolution μ_4, see Corollary 2.7, and we construct a spectrum Λ of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ such that the rescaled set $\Lambda/(b-1)$ is its maximal orthogonal set but not its spectrum, see Theorems 2.6, 5.1 and 5.2.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some preliminaries about (maximal) orthogonal sets for Cantor measures, and state our main results. In Sections 3, we consider the problem when a maximal orthogonal set is a spectrum. In Section 4, we discuss the necessity for a maximal orthogonal set to be a spectrum. In Section 5, we discuss rationally rescaling of a spectrum.

2. Preliminaries and main theorems

We start this section from recalling a characterization of orthogonal sets of a probability measure μ via its Fourier transform $\hat{\mu}$,

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i \xi x} d\mu(x).$$

Observe that the zero set of the Fourier transform $\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}$, see (3.6) for its explicit expression, is

$$Z_{q,b} = \{b^j a : \ a \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash q\mathbb{Z}, 0 \le j \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Then a discrete set Λ is an orthogonal set of $\mu_{q,b}$ if and only if we have the following for orthogonal sets of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ [2, 4]:

$$\Lambda - \Lambda \subset Z_{q,b} \cup \{0\}. \tag{2.1}$$

As orthogonal sets (maximal orthogonal sets and spectra) are invariant under translations, in this paper we always normalize them by assuming that

$$0 \in \Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}. \tag{2.2}$$

To introduce the tree structure of the maximal orthogonal set of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$, we need some notation and concepts. Denote $\Sigma_q := \{0, \cdots, q-1\}$, and $\Sigma_q^n := \underbrace{\Sigma_q \times \cdots \times \Sigma_q}_{n}$, $1 \le n \le \infty$ be the n copies of Σ_q, and $\Sigma_q^* := \bigcup_{1\le n<\infty} \Sigma_q^n$. Given $\delta = \delta_1\delta_2 \cdots \in \Sigma_q^* \cup \Sigma_q^\infty$ and $\delta' \in \Sigma_q^*$, we define $\delta'\delta$ is the concatenation of δ' and δ, and adopt the notation $0^\infty = 000\cdots$, $0^k = \underbrace{0\cdots 0}_{k}$. We call an element in $\Sigma_q^* \cup \Sigma_q^\infty$ as a *tree branch*. For each tree branch $\delta = \delta_1\delta_2\cdots$, denote

$$\delta|_k := \begin{cases} \delta_1\delta_2\cdots\delta_k & \text{when } \delta \in \Sigma_q^\infty, \text{and} \\ (\delta 0^\infty)|_k & \text{when } \delta \in \Sigma_q^*, \end{cases}$$

for all $k \ge 1$.

Definition 2.1. For $2 \le q, b/q \in \mathbb{Z}$, we say that a mapping $\tau : \Sigma_q^* \to \{-1, 0, \ldots, b-2\}$ is a *tree mapping* if

(i) $\tau(0^n) = 0$ for all $n \geq 1$, and

(ii) $\tau(\delta) \in \delta_n + q\mathbb{Z}$ if $\delta = \delta_1 \cdots \delta_n \in \Sigma_q^n, n \geq 1$,

and that a tree mapping τ is *maximal* if

(iii) for any $\delta \in \Sigma_q^*$ there exists $\delta' \in \Sigma_q^*$ such that $\tau((\delta\delta')|_n) = 0$ for sufficiently large integers n.

In [2], He, Lai and the author established the following characterization for a maximal orthogonal set of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ via some maximal tree mapping.

Theorem 2.2. ([2]) *Let $2 \leq q, b/q \in \mathbb{Z}$. Assume that Λ is a countable set of real numbers containing zero. Then Λ is a maximal orthogonal set of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ if and only if there exists a maximal tree mapping τ such that $\Lambda = \Lambda(\tau)$, where*

(2.3)

$$\Lambda(\tau) := \Big\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau(\delta|_n) b^{n-1} : \ \delta \in \Sigma_q^* \ \textit{such that} \ \ \tau(\delta|_m) = 0 \ \ \textit{for sufficiently large } m \Big\}.$$

Given a maximal tree mapping $\tau : \Sigma_q^* \to \{-1, 0, \ldots, b-2\}$, we say that $\delta \in \Sigma_q^n, n \geq 1$, is a *$\tau$-regular branch* if $\tau(\delta|_m) = 0$ for sufficiently large m. Define $\Pi_{\tau,n} : \Sigma_q^* \cup \Sigma_q^\infty \to \mathbb{R}, n \geq 1$, by

$$\Pi_{\tau,n}(\delta) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \tau(\delta|_k) b^{k-1}. \tag{2.4}$$

One may verify that the restriction of $\Pi_{\tau,n}$ onto Σ_q^n is one-to-one for any $n \geq 1$. For a τ-regular tree branch $\delta \in \Sigma_q^*$, we can extend the definition $\Pi_{\tau,n}(\delta), n \geq 1$, in (2.4) to $n = \infty$ by taking limit in (2.4),

$$\Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \tau(\delta|_k) b^{k-1}. \tag{2.5}$$

Applying the above b-nary expression, we conclude that a maximal orthogonal set of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ is the image of $\Pi_{\tau,\infty}$ for some maximal tree mapping τ,

$$\Lambda(\tau) = \{\Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta) : \ \delta \in \Sigma_q^* \text{ are } \tau\text{-regular branches}\}.$$

This together with Theorem 2.2 suggests that various maximal orthogonal sets of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ could be constructed by selecting maximal tree mapping appropriately.

Now we introduce a quantity to measure (minimal) level difference between a tree branch and its subbranches, which plays important role in our study of spectral property of Cantor measures. For $\delta' \in \Sigma_q^*$ and $\delta \in \Sigma_q^n$ for some $n \geq 1$, define

$$\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta}(\delta') = \#A_\delta(\delta') + \sum_{n_j \in B_\delta(\delta')} (n_j - n_{j-1} - 1), \tag{2.6}$$

where $A_\delta(\delta') := \{m \geq 1 : \ \tau(\delta\delta'|_m) \neq 0\}$, $B_\delta(\delta') := \{m \geq 1 : \ \tau(\delta\delta'|_m) \notin q\mathbb{Z}\}$, $n_0 = 0$, and $\{n_j\}_{j\geq 1}$ is a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers given by $\{n_j : j \geq 1\} = A_\delta(\delta')$, and $\#E$ is the cardinality of a set E.

Definition 2.3. Let $2 \le q, b/q \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\tau : \Sigma_q^* \to \{-1, 0, \dots, b-2\}$ be a maximal tree mapping. Define

$$\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta} := \inf\{\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta}(\delta') : \ \delta' \in \Sigma_q^*\}, \quad \delta \in \Sigma_q^*. \tag{2.7}$$

Given a maximal tree mapping $\tau : \Sigma_q^* \to \{-1, 0, \dots, b-2\}$, we say that $\delta \in \Sigma_q^n, n \ge 1$, is a a *$\tau$-main branch* if $\tau(\delta|_m) = 0$ for all $m > n$. Clearly $\delta \in \Sigma_q^*$ is a τ-regular branch if and only if either δ is a τ-main branch or $\delta 0^k$ is for some $k \ge 1$; and for any $\delta \in \Sigma_q^*$ there exists a τ-main subbranch $\delta\delta'$, where $\delta' \in \Sigma_q^*$. For any $\delta \in \Sigma_q^*$, one may verify that the quantity $\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta}$ is the minimal distance to its τ-main subbranches,

$$\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta} = \inf\{\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta}(\delta') : \ \delta\delta' \text{ are } \tau\text{-main branches}\} < \infty. \tag{2.8}$$

A challenging problem in spectral theory for the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ is when a maximal orthogonal set becomes a spectrum [2, 4, 6–8, 14, 23]. Now we present our main results of this paper. In our first main result, a sufficient condition via boundedness of $\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta}, \delta \in \Sigma_q^*$, is provided for a maximal orthogonal set of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ to its spectrum.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $2 \le q, b/q \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $\tau : \Sigma_q^* \to \{-1, 0, \dots, b-2\}$ is a maximal tree mapping such that*

$$\mathcal{D}_\tau := \sup\{\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta} : \delta \in \Sigma_q^*\} < \infty, \tag{2.9}$$

then $\Lambda(\tau)$ in (2.3) *is a spectrum of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$.*

We believe that the boundedness assumption on $\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta}, \delta \in \Sigma_q^*$, is a very weak sufficient condition for a maximal orthogonal set to be a spectrum. In fact, as shown in the next theorem, the above boundedness condition on $\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta}, \delta \in \Sigma_q^*$, is close to be necessary.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $2 \le q, b/q \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\tau : \Sigma_q^* \to \{-1, 0, \dots, b-2\}$ be a maximal tree mapping. If there exists a positive number ϵ_0 such that for each $n \ge 1$ and $\delta = \delta_1\delta_2\cdots\delta_n \in \Sigma_q^n$ with $\delta_n \ne 0$,*

$$\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta} \ge \epsilon_0 n, \tag{2.10}$$

then $\Lambda(\tau)$ in (2.3) *is not a spectrum of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$.*

Finally we apply our completeness results in Theorems 2.4 and 2.5 to the rescaling-invariant problem when the rescaled set $K\Lambda$ is a spectrum of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ if Λ is. This simple and natural way to construct new spectra from known ones is motivated from the conclusion that if $K = 5^k$ for some $k \ge 1$, then the rescaled set $K\Lambda_4 := \{K\lambda : \ \lambda \in \Lambda_4\}$ of the spectrum

$$\Lambda_4 := \Big\{\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} d_j 4^j, d_j \in \{0, 1\}\Big\} \tag{2.11}$$

of the Bernoulli convolution μ_4 is also a spectrum [7,8,14]. In the next theorem, we show that if the maximal tree mapping τ associated with the spectrum Λ satisfies the boundedness assumption (2.9), then the integrally rescaled set $K\Lambda$ is a spectrum of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ if and only if it is a maximal orthogonal set.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $2 \le q, b/q \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\tau : \Sigma_q^* \to \{-1, 0, \dots, b-2\}$ be a maximal tree mapping satisfying* (2.9)*, and $\Lambda(\tau)$ be as in* (2.3)*. Then for any integer K being prime with b, $K\Lambda(\tau)$ is a spectrum of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ if and only if it is a maximal orthogonal set.*

Applying Theorem 2.6, we find all possible integers K such that $K\Lambda_4$ are spectra of the Bernoulli convolution μ_4, c.f. [7, 8, 14].

Corollary 2.7. *Let Λ_4 be as in* (2.11) *and $K \ge 3$ be an odd integer. Then $K\Lambda_4$ is a spectrum of the Bernoulli convolution μ_4 if and only if there does not exist a positive integer N such that*

$$K \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_j 4^{j-1} \in (4^N - 1)\mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\} \tag{2.12}$$

for some $d_j \in \{0, 1\}, 1 \le j \le N$.

Given a spectral set Λ of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$, its irrational rescaling set $r\Lambda$ (i.e., $r \notin \mathbb{Q}$) is not an orthogonal set (and hence not a spectrum) by (2.2). The next question is when a rational rescaling set $r\Lambda$ is an orthogonal set, or a maximal orthogonal set, or a spectrum. A necessary condition is that $r\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$ by (2.2), but unlike integral rescaling discussed in Theorems 2.6 there are lots of interesting problems unsolved yet. In this paper, we apply Theorems 2.4 and 2.5 to construct a spectrum Λ of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ such that the rescaled set $\Lambda/(b-1)$ is its maximal orthogonal set but not its spectrum, see Theorem 5.2.

3. Maximal orthogonal sets and spectra: a sufficient condition

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.4. For that purpose, we need several technical lemmas on spectra of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$, a crucial lower bound estimate for its Fourier transform $\widehat{\mu}_{q,b}$, and an identity for multi-channel conjugate quadrature filters.

For an orthogonal set Λ of $L^2(\mu_{q,b})$ containing zero, let

$$Q_\Lambda(\xi) := \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi + \lambda)|^2. \tag{3.1}$$

Then Q_Λ is a real analytic function on the real line with $Q_\Lambda(0) = 1$, and

$$Q_\Lambda(\xi) = \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |\langle e_\lambda, e_{-\xi}\rangle|^2 \le \|e_{-\lambda}\|^2 = 1,\ \xi \in \mathbb{R},$$

where the equality holds if Λ is a spectrum. The converse is shown to be true in [2, 14]. This provides a characterization for an orthogonal set of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ to be its spectrum.

Lemma 3.1. ([2, 14]) *Let $2 \le q, b/q \in \mathbb{Z}$, and let $Q_\Lambda(\xi)$ be defined by* (3.1)*. Then an orthogonal set Λ of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ is a spectrum if and only if $Q_\Lambda(\xi) = 1$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$.*

For the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$, taking Fourier transform at both sides of the equation (1.1) leads to the following refinement equation in the Fourier domain:

$$\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi) = H_{q,b}(\xi/b) \cdot \widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi/b), \tag{3.2}$$

where

$$H_{q,b}(\xi) := \frac{1}{q} \sum_{l=0}^{q-1} e^{-2\pi i l b\xi/q} \tag{3.3}$$

is a periodic function with the properties that $H_{q,b}(0) = 1$,

$$H_{q,b}(\xi) = 0 \text{ if and only if } b\xi \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash q\mathbb{Z}, \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$H'_{q,b}(j/b) \neq 0 \text{ for all } j \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{3.5}$$

Applying (3.2) repeatedly and then taking limit $m \to \infty$, we obtain an explicit expression for the Fourier transform of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$:

$$\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi) = H_m(\xi)\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi/b^m) = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} H_{q,b}(\xi/b^j), \quad m \geq 1, \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$H_m(\xi) := \prod_{j=1}^{m} H_{q,b}(\xi/b^j), \ m \geq 1. \tag{3.7}$$

Let $2 \leq q, b/q \in \mathbb{Z}$. Define

$$r_0 := \inf_{|\xi|\leq(b-2)/(b-1)} |\widehat{\mu}_{q,b}(\xi)| \ \text{ and } \ r_1 := \inf_{1\leq j\leq q-1} \inf_{|\xi|\leq(b-2)/(b-1)} |\xi|^{-1}|H_{q,b}(\xi/b + j/b)|. \tag{3.8}$$

Then it follows from (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6) that both r_0 and r_1 are well-defined and positive,

$$r_0 > 0 \ \text{ and } \ r_1 > 0. \tag{3.9}$$

Set

$$T_b = \Big(-\frac{1}{b-1}, \frac{b-2}{b-1}\Big)\Big\backslash\Big(-\frac{1}{b(b-1)}, \frac{b-2}{b(b-1)}\Big). \tag{3.10}$$

For any $m \geq 1$ and $d_j \in \{-1, 0, \ldots, b-2\}, 1 \leq j \leq m$, with $d_m \neq 0$, one may verify that

$$\Big(\xi + \sum_{j=1}^{m} d_j b^{j-1}\Big)b^{-m} \in T_b \text{ for all } \xi \in \Big(-\frac{1}{b-1}, \frac{b-2}{b-1}\Big). \tag{3.11}$$

To prove Theorem 2.4, we need the following two lemmas which are related to the lower bound estimates of $|\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi + \lambda)|$ for $\xi \in T_b$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $2 \le q, b/q \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mu_{q,b}$ be the Cantor measure in* (1.1)*, and let $\lambda = \sum_{j=1}^{K} d_{n_j} b^{n_j-1}$ for some positive integers $n_j, 1 \le j \le K$, satisfying $0 =: n_0 < n_1 < \ldots < n_K$, and for some $d_{n_j}, 1 \le j \le K$, belonging to the set $\{-1, 1, 2, \ldots, b-2\}$. Then*

$$|\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi+\lambda)| \ge r_0^{K+1}\Big(\frac{r_1}{b(b-1)}\Big)^{\#B} b^{-\sum_{j\in B}(n_j-n_{j-1}-1)},\ \xi \in T_b, \tag{3.12}$$

where $B = \{1 \le j \le K :\ d_{n_j} \notin q\mathbb{Z}\}$ and r_0, r_1 are given in (3.8)*.*

Proof. For $0 \le i \le K$, define $\xi_0 = \xi$ and $\xi_i = (\xi + \sum_{j=1}^{i} d_{n_j} b^{n_j-1})/b^{n_i}$ for $1 \le i \le K$. Then

$$\xi_i \in T_b \ \text{ for all } \ 0 \le i \le K \tag{3.13}$$

by (3.11). Observe that

$$|H_{q,b}(\eta)| \le 1 \text{ for all } \eta \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \sup_{b\eta\in T_b} |H_{q,b}(\eta)| < 1. \tag{3.14}$$

The above observation, together with (3.6), (3.13) and the fact that $H_{q,b}$ has period q/b, implies

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{\ell=n_{i-1}+1}^{n_i} \big|H_{q,b}((\xi+\lambda)/b^\ell)\big| &= \prod_{\ell=n_{i-1}+1}^{n_i} \Big|H_{q,b}\Big(\Big(\xi + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} d_{n_j} b^{n_j-1} + d_{n_i} b^{n_i-1}\Big) b^{-\ell}\Big)\Big| \\ &= \prod_{\ell'=1}^{n_i-n_{i-1}} \big|H_{q,b}(\xi_{i-1}/b^{\ell'})\big| \ge |\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi_{i-1})| \ge r_0\end{aligned}$$

if $d_{n_i} \in q\mathbb{Z}$; and

$$\begin{aligned}&\prod_{\ell=n_{i-1}+1}^{n_i} \big|H_{q,b}((\xi+\lambda)/b^\ell)\big| \\ =\ & \Big(\prod_{\ell=n_{i-1}+1}^{n_i-1} \Big|H_{q,b}\Big(\Big(\xi + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} d_{n_j} b^{n_j-1}\Big) b^{-\ell}\Big)\Big|\Big) \cdot \Big|H_{q,b}\Big(\Big(\xi + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} d_{n_j} b^{n_j-1} + d_{n_i} b^{n_i-1}\Big) b^{-n_i}\Big)\Big| \\ \ge\ & |\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi_{i-1})| \cdot \big|H_{q,b}(\xi_{i-1}/b^{n_i-n_{i-1}} + d_{n_i}/b)\big| \ge r_0 r_1 |\xi_{i-1}|/b^{n_i-n_{i-1}-1} \\ \ge\ & r_0 r_1 b^{-n_i+n_{i-1}}/(b-1)\end{aligned}$$

if $d_{n_i} \notin q\mathbb{Z}$. Combining the above two lower bound estimates with

$$\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi+\lambda) = \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{K} \prod_{\ell=n_{i-1}+1}^{n_i} H_{q,b}((\xi+\lambda)/b^\ell)\Big) \cdot \widehat{\mu_{q,b}}((\xi+\lambda)/b^{n_K}) \tag{3.15}$$

proves (3.12). □

Lemma 3.3. *Let $2 \le q, b/q \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $\tau : \Sigma_q^* \to \mathbb{R}$ be a maximal tree mapping satisfying* (2.9)*. Then for each $\delta \in \Sigma_q^M$, $M > 0$, there exists $\delta' \in \Sigma_q^*$ such that*

$$|\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta\delta'))| \ge r^{2\mathcal{D}_\tau+2} |H_M(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,M}(\delta))|,\ \xi \in T_b, \tag{3.16}$$

where $r = \min\Big(r_0, \frac{1}{b}, \frac{r_1}{b(b-1)}\Big)$ and r_0, r_1 are defined in (3.8)*.*

Proof. If δ is a τ-main branch, we set $\delta' = 0$. In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta\delta'))| &= |\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,M}(\delta))| \\ &= |H_M(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,M}(\delta))| \cdot \big|\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}((\xi + \Pi_{\tau,M}(\delta))/b^M)\big| \\ &\geq \Big(\inf_{\eta\in(-1/(b-1),(b-2)/(b-1))} |\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\eta)|\Big) \cdot |H_M(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,M}(\delta))| \\ &\geq r_0 |H_M(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,M}(\delta))|, \ \xi \in T_b, \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

where the second equalities follows from(3.6), while the first inequality holds as $b^{-M}(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,M}(\delta)) \in (-1/(b-1), (b-2)/(b-1))$ for all $\xi \in T_b$.

Now consider δ is not a τ-main branch. In this case, define

$$\delta' := 0^m\delta'', \tag{3.18}$$

where $m \geq 1$ is the smallest integer such that $\tau(\delta|_{m+M}) \neq 0$, and $\delta'' \in \Sigma_q^*$ is so chosen that the quantities $\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta 0^m}(\delta'')$ in (2.6) and $\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta 0^m}$ in (2.7) are the same,

$$\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta 0^m}(\delta'') = \mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta 0^m}. \tag{3.19}$$

Let $\eta_1 = (\xi + \Pi_{\tau,M+m}(\delta 0^m))/b^{M+m}$ and $\eta_2 = (\xi + \Pi_{\tau,M}(\delta))/b^M$ for $\xi \in T_b$. Then

$$\eta_1 \in T_b \ \text{ and } \ \eta_2 \in \Big(-\frac{1}{b-1}, \frac{b-2}{b-1}\Big) \tag{3.20}$$

by (3.11) and $\tau(\delta 0^m) = \tau(\delta|_{m+M}) \neq 0$. Write

$$(\Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta 0^m\delta'') - \Pi_{\tau,M+m}(\delta 0^m\delta''))/b^{M+m} = \sum_{j=1}^{K} d_{n_j} b^{n_j-1}$$

for some integers $n_j, 1 \leq j \leq K$, satisfying $1 \leq n_1 < n_2 < \ldots < n_K$ and some $d_{n_j} \in \{-1, 1, 2, \ldots, b-2\}, 1 \leq j \leq K$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &\big|\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta\delta'))\big| \\ = \ &|H_M(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta\delta'))| \cdot \Big|\prod_{l=M+1}^{M+m} H_{q,b}((\xi + \Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta\delta'))/b^l)\Big| \\ &\cdot\big|\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}((\xi + \Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta\delta'))/b^{M+m})\big| \\ = \ &|H_M(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,M}(\delta))| \cdot \Big|\prod_{l=1}^{m} H_{q,b}(\eta_2/b^l)\Big| \cdot \Big|\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}\Big(\eta_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{K} d_j b^{n_j-1}\Big)\Big| \\ \geq \ &r_0 r^{2\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta 0^m}(\delta'')} |\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\eta_2)| \cdot |H_M(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,M}(\delta))| \geq r_0^2 r^{2\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta 0^m}} \big|H_M(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,M}(\delta))\big|, \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

where the first inequality follows from (3.6), (3.14) and Lemma 3.2. Combining (3.17) and (3.21) proves (3.16). □

Observe that $H_{q,b}(\xi)$ in (3.3) satisfies

$$\sum_{j=0}^{q-1} |H_{q,b}(\xi + j/b)|^2 = 1. \tag{3.22}$$

To prove Theorem 2.4, we need a similar identity for $H_m(\xi), m \geq 1$, with shifts in $\Pi_{\tau,m}(\Sigma_q^m)$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $2 \leq q, b/q \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\tau : \Sigma_q^* \to \mathbb{R}$ be a tree mapping, and let $H_m(\xi), m \geq 1$, be as in* (3.7)*. Then*

$$\sum_{\delta \in \Sigma_q^m} |H_m(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,m}(\delta))|^2 = 1, \ \xi \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.23}$$

Proof. For $m = 1$,

$$\sum_{\delta \in \Sigma_q^m} |H_m(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,m}(\delta))|^2 = \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} |H_{q,b}(\xi/b + \tau(j)/b)|^2 = \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} |H_{q,b}(\xi/b + j/b)|^2 = 1,$$

where the last equality follows from (3.22), and the second one holds as $H_{q,b}$ has period q/b and $\tau(j) - j \in q\mathbb{Z}, 0 \leq j \leq q-1$, by the tree mapping property for τ. This proves (3.23) for $m = 1$.

Inductively we assume that (3.23) hold for all $m \leq k$. Then for $m = k + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\delta \in \Sigma_q^m} |H_m(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,m}(\delta))|^2 \\
= &\sum_{\delta' \in \Sigma_q^k} \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} |H_k(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,k+1}(\delta' j))|^2 \cdot \left|H_{q,b}(\xi/b^{k+1} + \Pi_{\tau,k+1}(\delta' j)/b^{k+1})\right|^2 \\
= &\sum_{\delta' \in \Sigma_q^k} \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} |H_k(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,k}(\delta'))|^2 \cdot \left|H_{q,b}(\xi/b^{k+1} + \Pi_{\tau,k}(\delta')/b^{k+1} + j/b)\right|^2 = 1,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds as $H_{k+1}(\xi) = H_k(\xi)H_{q,b}(\xi/b^{k+1})$, the second one follows from the observations that H_k and $H_{q,b}$ are periodic functions with period $b^{k-1}q$ and q/b respectively and that

$$\Pi_{\tau,k+1}(\delta' j) = \Pi_{\tau,k}(\delta') + \tau(\delta' j)b^k \in \Pi_{\tau,k}(\delta') + jb^k + qb^k\mathbb{Z}, \ 0 \leq j \leq q-1,$$

by the tree mapping property for τ, and the last one is true by (3.22) and the inductive hypothesis. This completes the inductive proof. □

We have all ingredients for the proof of Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Let $Q(\xi) := Q_\Lambda(\xi)$ be the function in (3.1) associated with the maximal orthogonal set $\Lambda := \Lambda(\tau)$ of $L^2(\mu_{q,b})$. As Q is an analytic function on the real line, the spectral property for the maximal orthogonal set Λ reduces to proving $Q(\xi) \equiv 1$ for all $\xi \in T_b$ by Lemma 3.1. Suppose, on the contrary, there exists $\xi_0 \in T_b$ such that

$$Q(\xi_0) < 1. \tag{3.24}$$

For $n \geq 1$, set

$$\Lambda_n := \{\Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta) : \ \delta \in \Sigma_q^n \text{ such that } \tau \text{ is regular on } \delta\}, \tag{3.25}$$

and define

$$Q_n(\xi) := \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda_n} |\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi+\lambda)|^2,\ \xi\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{3.26}$$

Then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\Lambda_n = \Lambda \ \text{ and } \ \Lambda_n\subset\Lambda_{n+1} \text{ for all } n\ge 1,$$

since $\Lambda=\Lambda(\tau)$ and $\Sigma_q^*=\cup_{n=1}^\infty\Sigma_q^n$. This implies that $Q_n(\xi), n\ge 1$, is an increasing sequence that converges to $Q(\xi)$, i.e.,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} Q_n(\xi) = Q(\xi),\ \xi\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{3.27}$$

Thus for sufficiently small $\epsilon>0$ chosen later, there exists an integer N such that

$$Q(\xi_0)-\varepsilon\le Q_N(\xi_0)\le Q_n(\xi_0)\le Q(\xi_0)<1 \text{ for all } n\ge N. \tag{3.28}$$

For any $\delta\in\Sigma_q^n$ being τ-regular,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} H_m(\xi+\Pi_{\tau,m}(\delta)) = \lim_{m\to\infty} H_m(\xi+\Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta)) = \widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi+\Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta)),\ \xi\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{3.29}$$

For any $\delta\in\Sigma_q^n$ such that δ is not τ-regular, the set $\{m\ge n+1:\tau(\delta|_m)\ne 0\}$ contains infinite many integers. Denote that set by $\{m_j, j\ge 1\}$ for some strictly increasing sequence $\{m_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$. Recall that

$$\tau(\delta|_{m_j})\in q\mathbb{Z}\cap\{-1,1,2,\dots,b-2\} \text{ for all } j\ge 1 \tag{3.30}$$

by the tree mapping property for τ. Therefore for $m_j\le m<m_{j+1}$ with $j\ge 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|H_m(\xi+\Pi_{\tau,m}(\delta))| &\le |H_{m_j}(\xi+\Pi_{\tau,m}(\delta))| = |H_{m_j}(\xi+\Pi_{\tau,m_j}(\delta))| \\
&\le \prod_{k=1}^{j-1}\left|H_{q,b}((\xi+\Pi_{\tau,m_j}(\delta))/b^{m_k+1})\right| \\
&= \prod_{k=1}^{j-1}\left|H_{q,b}((\xi+\Pi_{\tau,m_k}(\delta))/b^{m_k+1})\right| \\
&\le \Big(\sup_{b\eta\in T_b}|H_{q,b}(\eta)|\Big)^{j-1},\ \xi\in T_b, \qquad (3.31)
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequalities follow from (3.11), (3.14) and (3.30), and the equalities hold by the tree mapping property τ and the q/b periodicity of the filter $H_{q,b}$. Combining (3.14) and (3.31) proves that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}|H_m(\xi+\Pi_{\tau,m}(\delta))| = 0,\ \xi\in T_b \tag{3.32}$$

if $\delta\in\Sigma_q^n$ is not τ-regular.

Applying (3.29) and (3.32) with n and ξ replaced by N and ξ_0 respectively, we can find a sufficient large integer $M\ge N+1$ such that

$$\sum_{\delta\in\Sigma_q^N}|H_M(\xi_0+\Pi_{\tau,M}(\delta))|^2 \le \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda_N}|\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi_0+\lambda)|^2+\varepsilon\le Q(\xi_0)+\varepsilon. \tag{3.33}$$

This together with Lemma 3.4 implies that

$$\sum_{\delta\in\Sigma_q^M\backslash\Sigma_q^N}|H_M(\xi_0+\Pi_{\tau,M}(\delta))|^2>1-Q(\xi_0)-\varepsilon>0, \tag{3.34}$$

where

$$\Sigma_q^M\backslash\Sigma_q^N=\{\delta\in\Sigma_q^M:\ \delta|_N0^\infty\neq\delta0^\infty\}.$$

Now, for each $\delta\in\Sigma_q^M\backslash\Sigma_q^N$, let $\lambda(\delta)=\Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta\delta')$ with δ' selected as in Lemma 3.3. Observe that $\lambda(\delta)-\Pi_{\tau,M}(\delta)\in b^M\mathbb{Z}$ for all $\delta\in\Sigma_q^M\backslash\Sigma_q^N$. This implies that $\lambda(\delta_1)\neq\lambda(\delta_2)$ for two distinct $\delta_1,\delta_2\in\Sigma_q^M\backslash\Sigma_q^N$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}Q(\xi_0)=\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda}|\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi_0+\lambda)|^2 &\geq \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda_N}|\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi_0+\lambda)|^2+\sum_{\delta\in\Sigma_q^M\backslash\Sigma_q^N}|\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi_0+\lambda(\delta))|^2\\ &\geq Q(\xi_0)-\varepsilon+r^{4\mathcal{D}_\tau+4}\sum_{\delta\in\Sigma_q^M\backslash\Sigma_q^N}|H_M(\xi+\Pi_{\tau,M}(\delta))|^2\\ &\geq Q(\xi_0)-\varepsilon+r^{4\mathcal{D}_\tau+4}(1-Q(\xi_0)-\varepsilon),\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (3.28) and Lemma 3.3, and the last holds by (3.34). This contradicts to (3.24) by letting ε chosen sufficiently small. □

4. Maximal orthogonal sets and spectra: a necessary condition

Given a tree mapping τ, define

$$\mathcal{N}_\tau(n):=\begin{cases}\inf_{0\neq\delta\in\Sigma_q}\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta}(0^\infty) & \text{if } n=1\\ \inf_{\delta\in\Sigma_q^n\backslash\Sigma_q^{n-1}}\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\delta}(0^\infty) & \text{if } n\geq 2,\end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

where $\Sigma_q^n\backslash\Sigma_q^{n-1}:=\{\delta' j:\ \delta'\in\Sigma_q^{n-1},1\leq j\leq q-1\}$. In this section, we establish the following strong version of Theorem 2.5.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $2\leq q,b/q\in\mathbb{Z}$, $\tau:\Sigma_q^*\to\{-1,0,\dots,b-2\}$ be a maximal tree mapping, and let $\mathcal{N}_\tau(n),n\geq 1$, be as in* (4.1)*. Set*

$$r_2:=\max\{|H_{q,b}(\xi)|:1/b\leq b(b-1)|\xi|\leq b-2\}.$$

If $\sum_{n=1}^\infty r_2^{2\mathcal{N}_\tau(n)}<\infty$, then $\Lambda(\tau)$ in (2.3) *is not a spectrum of $L^2(\mu_{q,b})$.*

For a maximal tree mapping τ satisfying (2.10),

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty r_2^{2\mathcal{N}_\tau(n)}\leq\sum_{n=1}^\infty r_2^{2\epsilon_0 n}<\infty,$$

where the last inequality holds as $|H_{q,b}(\xi)|<1$ if $b\xi\notin q\mathbb{Z}$. This together with Theorem 4.1 proves Theorem 2.5. Now it remains to prove Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let $N_0\geq 2$ be so chosen that $\mathcal{N}_\tau(n)\geq 1$ for all $n\geq N_0$. The existence follows the series convergence assumption on $\mathcal{N}_\tau(n),n\geq 1$. Take $\delta\in\Sigma_q^n\backslash\Sigma_q^{n-1}$ being τ-regular, where $n\geq N_0$. Write

$$\{m\geq n+1:\ \tau(\delta|_m)\neq 0\}=\{n_k:1\leq k\leq K\}$$

for some integers $n < n_1 < n_2 < \ldots < n_K$, where $K \geq \mathcal{N}_\tau(n)$. Therefore for $\xi \in T_b$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta))| &= |H_n(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta))| \cdot \left|\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}((\xi + \Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta))/b^n)\right| \\
&\leq |H_n(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,n}(\delta))| \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{K} \left|H_{q,b}((\xi + \Pi_{\tau,n_k}(\delta))/b^{-n_k-1})\right| \\
&\leq \Big(\sup_{\eta \in T_b} |H_{q,b}(\eta/b)|\Big)^K \cdot |H_n(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,n}(\delta))| \\
&\leq r_2^{\mathcal{N}_\tau(n)} |H_n(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,n}(\delta))|, \qquad (4.2)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds by (3.6); the first inequality follows from (3.6), (3.14) and $\tau(\delta|_{n_k}) \in q\mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq k \leq K$, by the tree mapping property for τ; the second inequality is true since $(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,n_k}(\delta))/b^{-n_k} \in T_b$ by (3.11); and the last inequality follows from the definition of the quality $\mathcal{N}_\tau(n)$.

Let Λ_n and $Q_n, n \geq 1$, be as in (3.25) and (3.26) respectively, and set $\Lambda_0 = \{0\}$ and $Q_0(\xi) = |\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi)|^2$. Then for $n \geq 1$ and $\xi \in T_b$,

$$\begin{aligned}
1 - Q_n(\xi) &= 1 - Q_{n-1}(\xi) - \sum_{\delta \in \Sigma_q^n \setminus \Sigma_q^{n-1} \text{ is } \tau\text{-regular}} |\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta))|^2 \qquad (4.3) \\
&\geq 1 - Q_{n-1}(\xi) - r_2^{2\mathcal{N}_\tau(n)} \sum_{\delta \in \Sigma_q^n \setminus \Sigma_q^{n-1}} |H_n(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,n}(\delta))|^2 \\
&\geq 1 - Q_{n-1}(\xi) - r_2^{2\mathcal{N}_\tau(n)} \Big(1 - \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n-1}} |\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi + \lambda)|^2\Big) \\
&= (1 - r_2^{2\mathcal{N}_\tau(n)}) \cdot (1 - Q_{n-1}(\xi)),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds because

$$\Lambda_n \setminus \Lambda_{n-1} = \{\Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\delta) : \ \delta \in \Sigma_q^n \setminus \Sigma_q^{n-1} \text{ is } \tau\text{-regular}\};$$

the first inequality is true by (4.2); and the second inequality follows from Lemma 3.4 and

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n-1}} |\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi + \lambda)|^2 \leq \sum_{\delta \in \Sigma_q^{n-1}} |H_n(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,n}(\delta))|^2, \ \ \xi \in \mathbb{R},$$

by (3.6) and (3.14). Recall that $\lim_{n\to\infty} Q_n(\xi) = Q(\xi), \xi \in \mathbb{R}$, by (3.27). Applying (4.3) repeatedly and using the convergence of $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r_2^{2\mathcal{N}_\tau(n)}$ gives

$$1 - Q(\xi) \geq \Big(\prod_{n=N_0+1}^{\infty} (1 - r_2^{2\mathcal{N}_\tau(n)})\Big) \cdot (1 - Q_{N_0}(\xi)), \ \ \xi \in T_b. \qquad (4.4)$$

On the other hand,

$$Q_{N_0}(\xi) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{N_0}} |\widehat{\mu_{q,b}}(\xi + \lambda)|^2 < \sum_{\delta \in \Sigma_q^{N_0}} |H_{N_0}(\xi + \Pi_{\tau,N_0}(\delta))|^2 = 1, \ \ \xi \in T_b$$

by (3.6), (3.14) and (3.23). This together with (4.4) proves that $Q(\xi) < 1$ for all $\xi \in T_b$, and hence $\Lambda = \Lambda(\tau)$ is a not a spectrum for $L^2(\mu_{q,b})$ by Lemma 3.1. □

5. Spectra rescaling

In this section, we first prove Theorem 2.6 in Subsection 5.1. We then consider verification of maximal orthogonality of the rescaled set $K\Lambda$ in Subsection 5.2. In that subsection, we show that the rescaled set $K\Lambda$ is not a maximal orthogonal set of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ if and only if the labeling tree $\tau(\Sigma_q^*)$ has certain periodic properties (5.1) and (5.3).

Theorem 5.1. *Let $2 \le q, b/q \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\tau : \Sigma_q^* \to \{-1, 0, \dots, b-2\}$ be a maximal tree mapping, $\Lambda := \Lambda(\tau)$ be as in* (2.3)*, and let $K > 1$ be an integer coprime with b. Then $K\Lambda$ is not a maximal orthogonal set of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ if and only if there exist $\delta \in \Sigma_q^\infty$ and a nonnegative integer M such that $\{\tau(\delta|_n)\}_{n=M+1}^\infty$ is a periodic sequence with positive period N, i.e.,*

$$\tau(\delta|_n) = \tau(\delta|_{n+N}),\ n \ge M+1, \tag{5.1}$$

and that the word $W = \omega_1\omega_2\cdots\omega_N$ defined by

$$\omega_j = \tau(\delta|_{M+j}), 1 \le j \le N, \tag{5.2}$$

is a repetend *of the recurring b-band decimal expression of i/K for some $i \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$, i.e.,*

(5.3)
$$\frac{i}{K} = 0.\omega_N\cdots\omega_2\omega_1\omega_N\cdots\omega_2\omega_1\omega_N\cdots = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\omega_j b^{j-Nn-1} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N \omega_j b^{j-1}}{b^N-1}.$$

By Theorems 2.6 and 5.1, we see that the rescaled set $K\Lambda$ is a spectrum if and only if the labeling tree of Λ contains no *repetend* of K.

For the spectrum Λ_4 of the Bernoulli convolution μ_4 in (2.11), the associated maximal tree mapping $\tau_{2,4}$ on Σ_2^* is given by

$$\tau_{2,4}(\delta) = \delta_n \ \text{ for } \ \delta = \delta_1\cdots\delta_n \in \Sigma_2^n,\ n \ge 1. \tag{5.4}$$

Thus $\mathcal{D}_{\tau_{2,4},\delta} = 0$ for all $\delta \in \Sigma_2^*$, and the requirement (2.9) is satisfied for the maximal tree mapping $\tau_{2,4}$. Hence Corollary 2.7 follows immediately from Theorem 2.6 and 5.1.

Finally in Subsection 5.3, we construct a spectrum Λ of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ such that $\Lambda/(b-1)$, a seemingly denser set than the spectrum Λ, is its maximal orthogonal set but not its spectrum.

Theorem 5.2. *Consider $2 \le q, b/q \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $b > 4$. Define a tree mapping $\kappa : \Sigma_q^* \to \{-1, 0, 1, \dots, b-2\}$ by*

$$\kappa(\delta|_{k+1}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \delta = 0 \text{ and } k \ge 0 \\ \delta & \text{if } 1 \le \delta \le q-1 \text{ and } k = 0 \\ q & \text{if } 1 \le \delta \le q-1 \text{ and } k \in \{1, 2, \cdots, K_\delta, 2b\} \\ 0 & \text{if } 1 \le \delta \le q-1 \text{ and } K_\delta < k \ne 2b \end{cases} \quad \text{if } \ \delta \in \Sigma_q^1, \tag{5.5}$$

where $0 \le K_\delta \le b-2$ *is the unique integer such that* $q(K_\delta+1)+\delta \in (b-1)\mathbb{Z}$*; and inductively*

$$\kappa(\delta|_{k+n}) = \begin{cases} j & \text{if } k=0 \\ q & \text{if } k \in \{1,2,\dots,K_\delta, n+2b-1\} \\ 0 & \text{if } k > K_\delta \text{ and } k \ne n+2b-1 \end{cases} \tag{5.6}$$

if $\delta = \delta' j$ *for some* $\delta' \in \Sigma_q^{n-1}, n \ge 2$ *and* $j \in \{1,\dots,q-1\}$*, where* $K_\delta \in \{0,1,\dots,b-2\}$ *is the unique integer such that*

$$\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \kappa(\delta|_i) + q(K_\delta+1) + j\Big) \in (b-1)\mathbb{Z}. \tag{5.7}$$

Then

$$\Lambda_{q,b} := \{\Pi_{\kappa,\infty}(\delta) : \ \delta \in \Sigma_q^*\} \tag{5.8}$$

is a spectrum of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$*, and the rationally rescaled set* $\Lambda_{q,b}/(b-1)$ *is its maximal orthogonal set but not its spectrum.*

5.1. **Proof of Theorem 2.6.** The necessity is obvious. Now we prove the sufficiency. Without loss of generality, we assume K is positive since $-\Lambda$ is a spectrum (maximal orthogonal set) if and only if Λ is. Let κ be the maximal tree mapping associated with the maximal orthogonal set $K\Lambda$ of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$. The existence of such a mapping follows from Theorem 2.2 and the assumption on $K\Lambda$. Denote the integral part of a real number x by $\lfloor x \rfloor$. By Theorem 2.4 and the assumption that $\mathcal{D}_\tau < \infty$, it suffices to prove that

$$\inf\{\mathcal{D}_{\kappa,\delta}(\delta'),\ \delta' \in \Sigma_q^*\} \le (2\lfloor \log_b K \rfloor + 4)(\mathcal{D}_\tau + 1),\ \delta \in \Sigma_q^*. \tag{5.9}$$

Take $\delta \in \Sigma_q^n, n \ge 1$, and let $\delta_1 \in \Sigma_q^*$ be so chosen that $\delta\delta_1$ is κ-regular. As $\Pi_{\kappa,\infty}(\delta\delta_1) \in K\Lambda$, there exists $\zeta \in \Sigma_q^n$ such that

$$K\Pi_{\tau,n}(\zeta) - \Pi_{\kappa,n}(\delta) \in b^n\mathbb{Z}. \tag{5.10}$$

Let $\zeta' \in \Sigma_q^*$ be so chosen that $\zeta\zeta'$ is a τ-main subbranch of ζ and

$$\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\zeta}(\zeta') = \mathcal{D}_{\tau,\zeta}, \tag{5.11}$$

where the existence of such a tree branch ζ' follows from (2.8). Therefore the verification of (5.9) reduces to showing the existence of $\delta' \in \Sigma_q^*$ such that $\delta\delta'$ is a κ-main branch,

$$K\Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\zeta\zeta') = \Pi_{\kappa,\infty}(\delta\delta'), \tag{5.12}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}_{\kappa,\delta}(\delta') \le (2\lfloor \log_b K \rfloor + 4)(\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\zeta} + 1). \tag{5.13}$$

By Theorem 2.2, there exists a κ-main branch $\delta_2 \in \Sigma_q^*$ such that

$$\Pi_{\kappa,\infty}(\delta_2) = K\Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\zeta\zeta'). \tag{5.14}$$

Then

$$\Pi_{\kappa,n}(\delta_2) - \Pi_{\kappa,n}(\delta) \in K\Pi_{\tau,n}(\zeta) - \Pi_{\kappa,n}(\delta) + b^n\mathbb{Z} = b^n\mathbb{Z} \tag{5.15}$$

by (5.10). This together with one-to-one correspondence of the mapping $\Pi_{\kappa,n} : \Sigma_q^n \to \mathbb{Z}$ proves $\delta_2 = \delta\delta'$ for some $\delta' \in \Sigma_q^*$.

The equation (5.12) follow from (5.14). Now it remains to prove (5.13). Without loss of generality, we assume that $\Pi_{\kappa,\infty}(\delta\delta') \neq \Pi_{\kappa,n}(\delta)$, because otherwise $\mathcal{D}_{\kappa,\delta}(\delta') = 0$ and hence (5.13) follows immediately. Thus we may write

$$\Pi_{\kappa,\infty}(\delta\delta') = \Pi_{\kappa,n}(\delta) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} d_l b^{n+m_l-1} \tag{5.16}$$

for a strictly increasing sequence $\{m_l\}_{l=1}^L$ of integers and some $d_l \in \{-1, 1, \dots, b-2\}, 1 \le l \le L$.

Also we may assume that $\Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\zeta\zeta') \neq \Pi_{\tau,n}(\zeta)$, because otherwise

$$K\Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\zeta\zeta') = K\Pi_{\tau,n}(\zeta) \in K(-b^n/(b-1), (b-2)b^n/(b-1))$$

and

$$\Pi_{\kappa,\infty}(\delta\delta') \notin (-b^{n+m_L-1}/(b-1), (b-2)b^{n+m_L-1}/(b-1))$$

by (3.11) and (5.16). This together with (5.12) implies that $b^{m_L-1} \le K$ and hence

$$\mathcal{D}_{\kappa,\delta}(\delta') \le m_L \le \lfloor \log_b K \rfloor + 1.$$

Therefore we can write

$$\Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\zeta\zeta') = \Pi_{\tau,n}(\zeta) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j b^{n+n_j-1},$$

where $c_j \in \{-1, 1, \dots, b-2\}, 1 \le j \le N$, and $\{n_j\}_{j=1}^N$ is a strictly increasing sequence of integers.

To prove (5.13) for the case that $\Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\zeta\zeta') \neq \Pi_{\tau,n}(\zeta)$, we need the following claim:

Claim 1: $\{m_l, 1 \le l \le L\} \subset \cup_{j=0}^{N} [n_j, n_j + \lfloor \log_b K \rfloor + 1]$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that Claim 1 does not hold. Then there exists $1 \le l \le L$ such that $n_{j_0} + \lfloor \log_b K \rfloor + 1 < m_l < n_{j_0+1}$ for some $0 \le j_0 \le N$, where we set $n_0 = 0$ and $n_{N+1} = +\infty$. Observe that

$$\Pi_{\kappa,n+m_l}(\delta\delta') - K\Pi_{\tau,n+n_{j_0}}(\zeta\zeta') \in b^{n+m_l}\mathbb{Z} \tag{5.17}$$

by (5.12) and the assumption $m_l < n_{j_0+1}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pi_{\kappa,n+m_l}(\delta\delta') - K\Pi_{\tau,n+n_{j_0}}(\zeta\zeta') \\ \in\ & d_l b^{n+m_l-1} + \frac{b^{n+m_l-1}-1}{b-1}[-1, b-2] - K\frac{b^{n+n_{j_0}}-1}{b-1}[-1, b-2] \\ \subset\ & d_l b^{n+m_l-1} + (-b^{n+m_l-1}, b^{n+m_l-1}) \end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

by the definitions of $\Pi_{\kappa,n+m_l}$ and $\Pi_{\tau,n+n_{j_0}}$ and the assumption $n_{j_0} + \log_b K + 1 < m_l$. Combining (5.17) and (5.18) leads to the contradiction that $d_l \in \{-1, 1, \dots, b-2\}$. This completes the proof of Claim 1. □

To prove (5.13) for the case that $\Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\zeta\zeta') \neq \Pi_{\tau,n}(\zeta)$, we need another claim:

Claim 2: If $n_j + \lfloor \log_b K \rfloor + 1 < n_{j+1}$, then there exists l_0 such that $m_{l_0} = n_{j+1}$, $m_{l_0-1} \in [n_j, n_j + \lfloor \log_b K \rfloor + 1]$ and $d_{l_0} \in q\mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $c_{j+1} \in q\mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. Let l_0 be the smallest integer l with $m_l \geq n_{j+1}$. By Claim 1, $m_{l_0-1} \leq n_j + \lfloor \log_b K \rfloor + 1 \leq n_{j+1} - 1$. Observe that $\Pi_{\kappa,n+m_{l_0}}(\delta\delta') - K\Pi_{\tau,n+n_{j+1}}(\zeta\zeta') \in b^{n+n_{j+1}}\mathbb{Z}$ by (5.12); and

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pi_{\kappa,n+m_{l_0}}(\delta\delta') - K\Pi_{\tau,n+n_{j+1}}(\zeta\zeta') \\ \in\ & d_{l_0} b^{n+m_{l_0}-1} - Kc_{j+1} b^{n+n_{j+1}-1} + \frac{b^{n+m_{l_0-1}}}{b-1}(-1, b-2) - \frac{Kb^{n+n_j}}{b-1}(-1, b-2) \\ \subset\ & d_{l_0} b^{n+m_{l_0}-1} - Kc_{j+1} b^{n+n_{j+1}-1} + b^{n+n_{j+1}-1}(-1, 1). \end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

Thus $d_{l_0} b^{m_{l_0}-n_{j+1}} - Kc_{j+1} \in b\mathbb{Z}$. This together, with the assumptions that $c_{j+1} \in \{-1, 1, \ldots, b-2\}$ and that K and b are coprime, implies that $m_{l_0} = n_{j+1}$ and $d_{l_0} \in q\mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $c_{j+1} \in q\mathbb{Z}$. From the argument in (5.19), we see that

$$\Pi_{\kappa,m_{l_0-1}}(\delta\delta') = K\Pi_{\tau,n_j}(\zeta\zeta'). \tag{5.20}$$

Thus $m_{l_0-1} \geq n_j$, as $\Pi_{\kappa,m_{l_0-1}}(\delta\delta') \in b^{m_{l_0-1}}(-1/(b-1), (b-2)/(b-1))$ and $K\Pi_{\tau,n_j}(\zeta\zeta') \notin Kb^{n_j-1}(-1/(b-1), (b-2)/(b-1))$ by (3.11). This completes the proof of Claim 2. □

Having established the above two claims, let us return to the proof of the inequality (5.13). Note that if

$$\{k \in \mathbb{Z} : m_{l_0-1} < k < m_{l_0}\} \not\subset \cup_{j=0}^{N} [n_j, n_j + \lfloor \log_b K \rfloor + 1]$$

for some $1 \leq l_0 \leq L$, then by Claim 1, there exists $1 \leq j_0 \leq N$ such that

$$m_{l_0-1} \leq n_{j_0-1} + \lfloor \log_b K \rfloor + 1 < n_{j_0} \leq m_{l_0}.$$

Then $m_{l_0} = n_{j_0}$, $m_{l_0-1} \geq n_{j_0-1}$ and $d_{l_0} \in q\mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $c_{j_0} \in q\mathbb{Z}$ by Claim 2. Thus

$$\cup_{d_l \notin q\mathbb{Z}} (m_{l-1}, m_l) \subset \left(\cup_{j=0}^{N} [n_j, n_j + \lfloor \log_b K \rfloor + 1]\right) \cup \left(\cup_{c_j \notin q\mathbb{Z}} (n_{j-1}, n_j)\right),$$

and thus

$$\sum_{d_l \notin q\mathbb{Z}} (m_l - m_{l-1} - 1) \leq (\lfloor \log_b K \rfloor + 2)(N+1) + \sum_{c_j \notin q\mathbb{Z}} (n_j - n_{j-1} - 1).$$

This together with Claim 1, implies

$$\mathcal{D}_{\kappa,\delta}(\delta') \leq 2(\lfloor \log_b K \rfloor + 2)(N+1) + \sum_{c_j \notin q\mathbb{Z}} (n_j - n_{j-1} - 1) \leq (2\lfloor \log_b K \rfloor + 4)(\mathcal{D}_{\tau,\zeta}(\zeta') + 1).$$

We get (5.13) and hence complete the proof of Theorem 2.6.

5.2. **Proof of Theorem 5.1.** ($\Longleftarrow$) Let

$$\lambda_0 = K\Pi_{\tau,M}(\delta) - ib^M, \tag{5.21}$$

where $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ is given in (5.3). Inductively applying (5.3) proves that

$$\lambda_0 = K\Pi_{\tau,M+N}(\delta) - ib^{M+N} = \cdots = K\Pi_{\tau,M+nN}(\delta) - ib^{M+nN},\ n \geq 1. \tag{5.22}$$

Take $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Now we show that $\exp(-2\pi i\lambda_0 x)$ is orthogonal to $\exp(-2\pi iK\lambda x)$. By the maximality of the tree mapping τ, there exists a τ-main branch $\zeta \in \Sigma_q^m$ for some $m \geq 1$ by Theorem 2.2 such that

$$\lambda = \Pi_{\tau,\infty}(\zeta). \tag{5.23}$$

Also for sufficiently large $n \geq 1$, there exists $\lambda_n \in \Lambda$ by the maximality of the tree mapping τ such that $\lambda_n \neq \lambda$ and

$$\lambda_n - \Pi_{\tau,M+Nn}(\delta) \in b^{M+Nn}\mathbb{Z}. \tag{5.24}$$

The reason for $\lambda_n \neq \lambda$ is that $\Pi_{\tau,M+Nn}(\delta) \neq \Pi_{\tau,M+Nn}(\zeta)$ for sufficiently large n by $W = \omega_1 \dots \omega_N \neq 0^N$ by (5.3).

As both $\lambda, \lambda_n \in \Lambda$, there exists a nonnegative integer l and an integer $a \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash q\mathbb{Z}$ by (2.1) such that

$$\lambda - \lambda_n = ab^l. \tag{5.25}$$

Now we show that

$$l < M + Nn \tag{5.26}$$

when n is sufficiently large. Suppose, on the contrary, that $l \geq M + Nn$. Then

$$\lambda - \Pi_{\tau,M+Nn}(\delta) \in b^{M+Nn}\mathbb{Z}. \tag{5.27}$$

On the other hand,

$$\Pi_{\tau,M+Nn}(\delta) \in b^{M+Nn}[-1/(b-1), (b-2)/(b-1)]$$

by the tree mapping property for τ. Therefore $\lambda = \Pi_{\tau,M+Nn}(\delta)$ for sufficiently large n, which is a contradiction as

$$\Pi_{\tau,M+Nn}(\delta) \notin b^{M+N(n-1)}(-1/(b-1), (b-2)/(b-1))$$

by $W = \omega_1 \dots \omega_N \neq 0^N$ and the tree mapping property for τ.

Combining (5.24), (5.25) and (5.26) and recalling that K and b are co-prime, we obtain that

$$K\lambda - K\Pi_{\tau,M+Mn}(\delta) = \tilde{a}b^l \tag{5.28}$$

for some integers $0 \leq l < M + Nn$ and $\tilde{a} \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash q\mathbb{Z}$. Thus the inner product between $\exp(-2\pi i\lambda_0 x)$ and $\exp(-2\pi iK\lambda x)$ is equal to zero by (2.1), (5.22) and (5.28). This proves that $K\Lambda$ is not a maximal orthogonal set as $\lambda \in \Lambda$ is chosen arbitrarily.

($\Longrightarrow$) By (2.1) and the assumption on the rescaled set $K\Lambda$, there exists a maximal orthogonal set Θ of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ such that

$$K\Lambda \subsetneq \Theta \subset \mathbb{Z}. \tag{5.29}$$

Take $\vartheta_0 \in \Theta\backslash(K\Lambda)$. Then

$$\vartheta_0 = \Pi_{\kappa,\infty}(\zeta_0) = \Pi_{\kappa,m}(\zeta_0) \tag{5.30}$$

for some κ-main branch $\zeta_0 \in \Sigma_q^m, m \geq 1$, where κ is the maximal tree mapping associated with the maximal orthogonal set Θ.

Let τ be the maximal tree mapping in Theorem 2.2 such that $\Lambda = \Lambda(\tau)$. To establish the necessity, we need the following claim:

Claim 3: Let $n \geq 1$. For any $\zeta \in \Sigma_q^n$ there exists a unique $\delta \in \Sigma_q^n$ such that $\Pi_{\kappa,n}(\zeta) - K\Pi_{\tau,n}(\delta) \in b^n\mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. Observe that

$$K\Pi_{\tau,n}(\delta_1) - K\Pi_{\tau,n}(\delta_2) \notin b^n\mathbb{Z} \quad \text{for all distinct } \delta_1, \delta_2 \in \Sigma_q^n, \tag{5.31}$$

because $b/q \in \mathbb{Z}$, K and b are coprime, and $\Pi_{\tau,n}(\delta_1) - \Pi_{\tau,n}(\delta_2) = ab^l$ for some $0 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $a \notin q\mathbb{Z}$. On the other hand,

$$\{K\Pi_{\tau,n}(\delta) : \delta \in \Sigma_q^n\} + b^n\mathbb{Z} = K\Lambda + b^n\mathbb{Z} \subset \Theta + b^n\mathbb{Z} = \{\Pi_{\kappa,n}(\zeta) : \zeta \in \Sigma_q^n\} + b^n\mathbb{Z} \tag{5.32}$$

by (5.29). Combining (5.31) and (5.32) leads to

$$\{K\Pi_{\tau,n}(\delta) : \delta \in \Sigma_q^n\} + b^n\mathbb{Z} = \{\Pi_{\kappa,n}(\zeta) : \zeta \in \Sigma_q^n\} + b^n\mathbb{Z}. \tag{5.33}$$

Then Claim 3 follows from (5.33) and (5.31). □

To establish the necessity, we need another claim:

Claim 4: $\vartheta_0 \notin K\mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $\vartheta_0 \in K\mathbb{Z}$. Then for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$, there exist $a \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash q\mathbb{Z}$ and $0 \leq l \in \mathbb{Z}$ by (2.1) and (5.29) such that $\vartheta_0 - K\lambda = ab^l$. This together with the co-prime assumption between K and b implies that $a/K \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 \neq \vartheta_0/K - \lambda \in (a/K)b^l$. Thus $\Lambda \cup \{\vartheta_0/K\}$ is an orthogonal set for the measure $\mu_{q,b}$ by (2.1), which contradicts to the maximality of the set Λ. □

Now we continue our proof of the necessity. Let N be the smallest positive integer such that $(b^N - 1)\vartheta_0/K \in \mathbb{Z}$, where the existence follows from the co-prime property between K and b. By Claim 4, there exists $\omega_j \in \{-1, 0, \ldots, b-2\}, 1 \leq j \leq N$, such that the word $W := \omega_1\omega_2\cdots\omega_N \neq 0$ and

$$\frac{\vartheta_0}{K} = c.\omega_N\cdots\omega_2\omega_1\omega_N\cdots\omega_2\omega_1\cdots = c + \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N \omega_j b^{j-1}}{b^N - 1} \tag{5.34}$$

for some integer $c \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $W' = \omega_1'\omega_2'\cdots\omega_N'$ be so chosen that $\omega_j' \in \{-1, 0, \ldots, b-2\}, 1 \leq j \leq N$, and

$$\sum_{j=1}^N (\omega_j' + \omega_j)b^{j-1} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \sum_{j=1}^N \omega_j b^{j-1} \in \frac{b^N-1}{b-1}[-1, 1) \\ b^N - 1 & \text{if } \sum_{j=1}^N \omega_j b^{j-1} \in \frac{b^N-1}{b-1}[1, b-2]. \end{cases} \tag{5.35}$$

The existence of such a word W' follows from the observation that

$$\Big\{\sum_{j=1}^N \omega_j b^{j-1}, \omega_j \in \{-1, 0, \ldots, b-2\}\Big\} = \Big(\frac{b^N - 1}{b-1}[-1, b-2]\Big) \cap \mathbb{Z}.$$

Let $n > m/N$ and set $\zeta_{nN} = \zeta_0 0^{nN-m} \in \Sigma_q^{nN}$. By Claim 3 and the κ-main branch assumption for ζ_0, there exists $\delta_{nN} \in \Sigma_q^{nN}$ such that

$$K\Pi_{\tau,nN}(\delta_{nN}) - \vartheta_0 \in b^{nN}\mathbb{Z}. \tag{5.36}$$

Combining (5.34), (5.35) and (5.36) and recalling that K and b are coprime, we obtain

$$(b^N - 1)(\Pi_{\tau,nN}(\delta_{nN}) - \tilde{c}) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \omega'_j b^{j-1} \in b^{nN}\mathbb{Z},$$

where

$$\tilde{c} = \begin{cases} c & \text{if } \sum_{j=1}^{N} \omega_j b^{j-1} \in \frac{b^N-1}{b-1}[-1, 1) \\ c-1 & \text{if } \sum_{j=1}^{N} \omega_j b^{j-1} \in \frac{b^N-1}{b-1}[1, b-2]. \end{cases}$$

Therefore

$$\Pi_{\tau,nN}(\delta_{nN}) - \tilde{c} - \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \omega'_j b^{j-1}\Big)(1 + b^N + \cdots + b^{(n-1)N}) \in b^{nN}\mathbb{Z}. \tag{5.37}$$

By the construction of $\omega'_j, 1 \le j \le N$, $\sum_{j=1}^{N} \omega'_j b^{j-1} \in \frac{b^N-1}{b-1}(-1, b-2]$. If either $\sum_{j=1}^{N} \omega'_j b^{j-1} \in \frac{b^N-1}{b-1}(-1, b-2)$ or $\sum_{j=1}^{N} \omega'_j b^{j-1} = \frac{b^N-1}{b-1}(b-2)$ and $\tilde{c} \le 0$, then for sufficiently large k,

$$\tilde{c} + \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \omega'_j b^{j-1}\Big)(1 + b^N + \cdots + b^{(k-1)N}) = \sum_{j=1}^{kN} \theta_j b^{j-1}$$

for some $\theta_j \in \{-1, 0, \ldots, b-2\}, 1 \le j \le kN$, as it is contained in $[-(b^{kN} - 1)/(b - 1), (b^{kN} - 1)(b - 2)/(b - 1)]$. This together with (5.37) implies that

$$\Pi_{\tau,nN}(\delta_{nN}) = \sum_{j=1}^{kN} \theta_j b^{j-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \omega'_j b^{j-1}(b^{kN} + \cdots + b^{(n-1)N})$$

for $n \ge k$. Thus there exists $\delta \in \Sigma_q^{\infty}$ such that $\delta|_{nN} = \delta_{nN}$ and

$$\tau(\delta|_{nN+j}) = \omega'_j, 1 \le j \le N$$

for $n \ge k$, which proves the desired conclusion.

Now consider the case that $\sum_{j=1}^{N} \omega'_j b^{j-1} = \frac{b^N-1}{b-1}(b-2)$ and $\tilde{c} > 0$. In this case, $\omega'_j = b - 2$ for all $1 \le j \le N$ and $N = 1$ by the selection of the integer N. Further we obtain from (5.37) that

$$\Pi_{\tau,n}(\delta_n) - \tilde{c} + 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b^{j-1} \in b^n\mathbb{Z},$$

which implies that there exists $\delta \in \Sigma_q^{\infty}$ such that $\delta|_n = \delta_n$ and $\tau(\delta|_n) = -1$ for sufficiently large n, which proves the desired conclusion.

5.3. **Proof of Theorem 5.2.** First we show that $\Lambda_{q,b}$ is a spectrum of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$. Observe that κ is a maximal tree mapping, every $\delta \in \Sigma_q^*$ is κ-regular, and $\Lambda_{q,b} = \Lambda(\kappa)$. We then obtain from Theorem 2.2 that

(5.38) $\Lambda_{q,b}$ is a maximal orthogonal set of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$.

From the definition of the maximal tree mapping κ it follows that

$$\mathcal{D}_{\kappa,\delta} \le \mathcal{D}_{\kappa,\delta}(0^\infty) \le K_\delta + 1 \le b - 1 \ \text{ for all } \ \delta \in \Sigma_q^*, \tag{5.39}$$

where K_δ is given in (5.7). Therefore the spectral property for $\Lambda_{q,b}$ holds by (5.38), (5.39) and Theorem 2.4.

Next we prove that $\Lambda_{q,b}/(b-1)$ is a maximal orthogonal set for the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$. From (2.1) and the spectral property for the set $\Lambda_{q,b}$ We obtain that

$$\Lambda_{q,b} - \Lambda_{q,b} \subset \{b^j a : \ 0 \le j \in \mathbb{Z}, a \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash q\mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{0\}. \tag{5.40}$$

On the other hand,

$$0 \in \Lambda_{q,b} \subset \mathbb{Z}$$

and for any $\delta \in \Sigma_q^*$,

$$\Pi_{\kappa,\infty}(\delta) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa(\delta|_j) b^{j-1} \in \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa(\delta|_j) + (b-1)\mathbb{Z} = (b-1)\mathbb{Z} \tag{5.41}$$

by (5.5)–(5.7). Combining (5.40) and (5.41) leads to

$$(\Lambda_{q,b} - \Lambda_{q,b})/(b-1) \subset \{b^j a : \ 0 \le j \in \mathbb{Z}, a \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash q\mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{0\},$$

and hence $\Lambda_{q,b}/(b-1)$ is an orthogonal set for the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ by (2.1). Now we establish the maximality of the rescaled set $\Lambda_{q,b}/(b-1)$. Suppose, on the contrary, that there exists $\lambda_0 \notin \Lambda_{q,b}/(b-1)$ such that $\tilde{\Lambda}_{q,b} := \Lambda_{q,b}/(b-1) \cup \{\lambda_0\}$ is an orthogonal set for the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (b-1)\tilde{\Lambda}_{q,b} - (b-1)\tilde{\Lambda}_{q,b} &\subset (b-1)(\{b^j a : \ 0 \le j \in \mathbb{Z}, a \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash q\mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{0\}) \\ &\subset \{b^j a : \ 0 \le j \in \mathbb{Z}, a \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash q\mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{0\} \end{aligned}$$

and $(b-1)\tilde{\Lambda}_{q,b}$ is an orthogonal set for the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$ by (2.1). This contradicts the spectral property for $\Lambda_{q,b}$.

Finally we prove that $\Lambda_{q,b}/(b-1)$ is not a spectrum of the Cantor measure $\mu_{q,b}$. Let $\tau_{q,b} : \Sigma_q^* \to \{-1, 0, \ldots, b-2\}$ be the maximal tree mapping such that $\Lambda_{q,b}/(b-1) = \Lambda(\tau_{q,b})$. By Theorem 4.1, the non-spectral property for the set $\Lambda_{q,b}/(b-1)$ reduces to showing that

$$\mathcal{D}_{\tau_{q,b},\delta}(0^\infty) \ge n \tag{5.42}$$

for all $\delta \in \Sigma_q^n \backslash \Sigma_q^{n-1}$, $n \ge 2$, being $\tau_{q,b}$-regular. Recall that $\Lambda_{q,b} = \Lambda(\kappa)$. This together with (5.5) and (5.6) implies the existence of $\eta \in \Sigma_q^m$, $m \ge 1$, such that

$$(b-1)\Pi_{\tau_{q,b},\infty}(\delta) = \Pi_{\kappa,\infty}(\eta) = \sum_{j=1}^{m+b-2} d_j b^{j-1} + q \cdot b^{2m+2b-2}, \tag{5.43}$$

where $d_j \in \{0, 1, \cdots, q\}$ for all $1 \le j \le m+b-2$ and $d_m \in \{1, \ldots, q-1\}$. Write

$$\Pi_{\tau_{q,b},\infty}(\delta) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j b^{j-1} = \sum_{j=1}^{M} c_j b^{j-1} \tag{5.44}$$

where $c_j := \tau_{q,b}(\delta|_j) \in \{-1, 0, \ldots, b-2\}$ and $M \ge n$ is so chosen that $c_M \ne 0$. The existence of such an integer follows from $\tau_{q,b}(\delta|_n) \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash q\mathbb{Z}$ and $\tau_{q,b}(\delta|_j) = 0$ for sufficiently large j. Combining (5.43) and (5.44) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^{M} c_j b^{j-1} &= \frac{1}{b-1}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{m+b-2} d_j b^{j-1} + q\cdot b^{m+b-2}\Big) + q\sum_{j=m+b-2}^{2m+2b-3} b^j \\ &\in q\sum_{j=m+b-2}^{2m+2b-3} b^j + \Big(0, \frac{b-2}{b-1}\Big) b^{m+b-2},\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows as $q \le b-3$. This, together with $c_j \in \{-1, 0, 1, \ldots, b-2\}, 1 \le j \le M$, implies that

$$M = 2m+2b-2 \text{ and } c_j = q, m+b-2 < j \le M. \tag{5.45}$$

On the other hand, for $\delta \in \Sigma_q^n \backslash \Sigma_q^{n-1}$ it follows from the tree mapping property for $\tau_{q,b}$ that $c_n \notin q\mathbb{Z}$. Thus $n \le m+b-2$ according to (5.45). Therefore

$$\mathcal{D}_{\tau_{q,b},\delta}(0^\infty) \ge M - (m+b-2) \ge n.$$

This proves (5.42) and then the conclusion that $\Lambda_{q,b}$ is not a spectrum of the Cantor set $\mu_{q,b}$ by Theorem 4.1.

References

[1] X.-R. Dai, *When does a Bernoulli convolution admit a spectrum?*, Adv. Math., 231(2012), 1681–1693.

[2] X.-R. Dai, X.-G. He and C.-K. Lai, *Spectral property of Cantor measures with consecutive digits*, Adv. Math., 242(2013), 187–208.

[3] X.-R. Dai, X.-G. He and C.-K. Lai, *Law of pure types and some exotic spectra of fractal spectral measures*, Geometry and Analysis of Fractals D.-J. Feng and K. S. Lau (eds.), Springer Proceeding in Mathematics & Statistics 88, pp 47–64, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2014..

[4] X.-R. Dai, X.-G. He and K.-S. Lau, *On spectral N-Bernoulli measures*, Adv. Math., 259(2014), 511–531.

[5] X.-R. Dai and Q. Sun, *Spectral measures with arbitrary Hausdorff dimensions*, J. Funct. Anal., to appear.

[6] D. Dutkay, D. Han and Q. Sun, *On spectra of a Cantor measure*, Adv. Math., 221(2009), 251–276.

[7] D. Dutkay, D. Han and Q. Sun, *Divergence of mock and scrambled Fourier series on fractal measures*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 366(2014), 2191–2208.

[8] D. Dutkay and P. Jorgensen, *Fourier duality for fractal measures with affine scales*, Math. Comp., 81(2012), 2253–2273.

[9] D. Dutkay and C.-K. Lai, *Uniformity of measures with Fourier frames*, Adv. Math., 252(2014), 684–707.

[10] K. J. Falconer, *Fractal Geometry, Mathematical Foundations and Applications*, Wiley, New York, 1990.

[11] B. Fuglede, *Commuting self-adjoint partial differential operators and a group theoretic problem*, J. Funct. Anal., 16(1974), 101–121.
[12] X.-G. He, C.-K. Lai and K.-S. Lau, *Exponential spectra in $L^2(\mu)$*, Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal., 34(2013), 327–338.
[13] T.-Y. Hu and K.-S. Lau, *Spectral property of the Bernoulli convolutions*, Adv. Math., 219(2008), 554–567.
[14] P. Jorgensen and S. Pedersen, *Dense analytic subspaces in fractal L^2 spaces*, J. Anal. Math., 75(1998), 185–228.
[15] I. Łaba and Y. Wang, *On spectral Cantor measures*, J. Funct. Anal., 193(2002), 409–420.
[16] J. C. Lagarias and Y. Wang, *Tiling the line by the translates of one tile*, Invent. Math., 124(1996), 341–365.
[17] H. Landau, *Necessary density conditions for sampling and interpolation of certain entire functions*, Acta Math., 117(1967), 37–52.
[18] N. Levinson, *Gap and Density Theory*, Am. Math. Soc. Colloq. Publ., Vol 26., New York 1940.
[19] J. Ortega-Cerdà and K. Seip, *Fourier frames*, Ann. of Math. (2), 255(2002), 789–806.
[20] R. E. A. C. Paley and N. Weiner, *Fourier Transform In The Complex Domain*, Am. Math. Soc. Colloq. Publ., Vol 19., New York 1934.
[21] A. Poltoratski, *A problem on completeness of exponentials*, Ann. of Math. (2), 178(2013), 983–1016.
[22] A. Poltoratski, *Spectral gaps for sets and measures*, Acta Math., 208(2012), 151–209.
[23] R. S. Strichartz, *Convergence of mock Fourier series* , J. Anal. Math., 99(2006), 333–353.
[24] T. Tao, *Fuglede's conjecture is false in 5 or higher dimensions*, Math. Res. Lett., 11(2004), 251–258.
[25] R. M. Young, *An Introduction to Nonharmonic Fourier Series*, Acdemic, New York, 1980.

School of Mathematics and Computational Science, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, 510275, P. R. China

E-mail address: daixr@mail.sysu.edu.cn